<b>Permit No.:</b> 143023	Company Name: Hunt Oil Company	APD Reviewer: Ms. Lillian Hayes
<b>Project No.:</b> 261484	Site/Area Name: Davis Central Facility	SP No.: 6002 - NON RULE 2012-NOV-08

GENERAL INFORMATION			
Regulated Entity No.:	RN106856420	Project Type:	Standard Permit Application
Customer Reference No.:	CN600551477	Date Received by TCEQ:	November 17, 2016
City/County:	Poth, Wilson County	Date Received by Reviewer:	November 28, 2016
		Physical Location:	from the intx of highway 181 & westmeyer go ne on westmeyer for 1.5 mi turn right on fm 541 & go 7.33 mi to site on right

CONTACT INFORMATION					
Responsible Official/Primary Contact Name and Title:	Mr. David Adams Production Manager	Phone No.: Fax No.:	(830) 484-3721	Email:	DADAMS@HUNTOILC OM
Technical Contact/Consultant Name and Title:	Mr. Justin Wheeler Senior EHS Representative	Phone No.: Fax No.:	(214) 978-8123	Email:	JWHEELER@HUNTCO NSOLIDATED.COM

GENERAL RULES CHECK	YES	NO	COMMENTS
Is confidential information included in the application?		X	
Has the standard permit fee been paid?	X		
Are there associated NSR or Title V permits at the site?	X		PBR 112110 will be voided upon issuance of this Standard Permit.
Is the application for renewal of an existing standard permit?		X	
Do NSPS, NESHAP, or MACT standards apply to this registration?	X		NSPS OOOO (No affected storage vessels). NSPS OOOOa
Is the following documentation included with this registration?  1. The General Requirements Checklist demonstrating compliance with 30 TAC §§ 116.110 and 116.601-615  2. Process description  3. Project description  4. Descriptions of any equipment being installed  5. Emissions calculations including the basis of the calculations  6. Emission increases and/or decreases associated with this project (quantified)  7. Description of efforts to minimize any collateral emissions or collateral increases	X		
Are any requirements of 116.110 circumvented by: (1) artificially limiting feed or production rates below the maximum capacity of the project's equipment; (2) claiming a limited chemical list; or (3) dividing and registering a project in separate segments?		X	

NONATTAINMENT AND PSD CHECK	YES NO	COMMENTS
Is the site located in a nonattainment area?	X	
Does NOx Cap and Trade apply to this registration?	X	
Are emissions increasing above the PSD significance levels at an existing PSD major source site?	X	

MAINTENANCE, STARTUP, AND SHUTDOWN (MSS) EMISSIONS	YES	NO	COMMENTS
Are planned MSS emissions being registered with this	X		
authorization?			
MSS emissions for all planned MSS activities must be registered for			
all oil and gas sites beginning January 5, 2014.			
Have any emissions associated with all planned MSS	X		
events/activities been estimated and calculations provided?			

<b>Permit No.:</b> 143023	Company Name: Hunt Oil Company	APD Reviewer: Ms. Lillian Hayes
<b>Project No.:</b> 261484	Site/Area Name: Davis Central Facility	SP No.: 6002 - NON RULE 2012-NOV-08

Non Rule Standard Permit Requirements		
REQUIREMENTS	YES, NO, or NA	COMMENTS
What is the distance to the nearest receptor?	11.3, 110, 01 111	Actual distance: >50 feet.
If the distance to the nearest receptor is less than 50 feet, are	N/A	Actual distance. >50 rect.
fugitive components used for isolation or safety purposes the	14/74	
only emission sources located one-half the width of any		
applicable easement?		
Are the total benzene emissions greater than 0.039 lb/hr?	Yes	Total benzene emissions: 0.05 lb/hr
Are the project's maximum predicted concentrations of benzene	103	Impacts Provided
at the nearest receptor equal to or less than 10% of the		Impacts frovided
appropriate effects screening level (ESL)?		
Benzene short-term ESL: 170 µg/m³		
Benzene long-term ESL: 4.5 µg/m³		
What is the distance to the nearest property line?		Actual distance: >50 feet.
Are the total H <sub>2</sub> S emissions greater than 0.025 lb/hr?	Yes	Total H <sub>s</sub> S emissions: 0.34 lb/hr
Are the project's maximum predicted concentrations of H <sub>2</sub> S at the	103	Impacts Provided
nearest property line equal to or less than the significant impact		Impacts frovided
level (SIL)?		
H <sub>2</sub> S hourly SAAQS: 108 µg/m <sup>3</sup>		
Are the total SO <sub>2</sub> emissions greater than 2.0 lb/hr?	Yes	Total SO, emissions: 12.48 lb/hr
Are the project's maximum predicted concentrations of SO <sub>2</sub> at the	103	SCREEN 3 provided.
nearest property line equal to or less than the significant level		SCREEN 5 provided.
(SIL)?		Company used out of county SO2 monitors to
SO, hourly SAAQS: 196 µg/m³		calculate background concentration. Application went
2 πουτή στιτου. 150 μg/ π		through TCEQ Modeling Team and was approved.
		an ough rend modeling ream and was approved.
Are the total NOx emissions greater than 4.0 lb/hr?	No	Total NOx emissions: 0.93 lb/hr
Are the project's maximum predicted concentrations of NOx at		SCREEN 3 provided
the nearest property line equal to or less than the significant		_
impact level (SIL)?		
NOx hourly SAAQS: 188 µg/m³		
Are there any engines or turbines located at the site?	No	
Are there any open-topped tanks or ponds located at the site?	No	
Will the site comply with all fugitive requirements listed in the	Yes	$_{\perp}X_{\perp}$ < 10 tpy VOC or < 1 tpy H <sub>2</sub> S
Best Management Practices subsection?		$ \_\_ \ge 10 \text{ tpy VOC or } \ge 1 \text{ tpy H}_3 \hat{S}$
If Leak Detection and Repair (LDAR) alternative fugitive		$\geq$ 25 tpy VOC or $\geq$ 5 tpy H <sub>2</sub> S
monitoring is required, Table 9 must be met.		LDAR program: No
Are there any tanks or vessels located at the site?	Yes	
Will all tanks and vessels be of a color that minimizes the effects	Yes	
of solar heating as stated in the rule?		
When relying on control or recovery devices in emission	Yes	
calculations, will the owner/operator monitor and keep records		
according to Table 8?		
Are any of the following units needed to meet the limitations of	No	process reboilers, heaters, and furnaces (used for
the rule?		control)
		vapor recovery units
		thermal oxidation and vapor combustion devices
		(not including flares)
Will the appropriate level of monitoring be implemented based on	Yes	
any reduction efficiencies claimed?		
Are there any flares or thermal oxidizers located at the site	Yes	
needed to meet the limitations of the rule?		
Is the site in compliance with all other requirements.	Yes	

#### DESCRIBE OVERALL PROCESS AT THE SITE

The Davis Central Site production wells deliver produced liquids via pipeline to heater treaters to enable the three-phase separation of gas and water from the oil/condensate. The heater treater is fueled by sour gas. The H2S content of fuel gas is limited to 10,970 ppmv. A chemical gas scavenger unit may be added to the site if H2S concentrations measured at the site warrant the use of the equipment. A maximum of two heaters can be fired simultaneously. Oil/condensate from the heater treaters is routed to the vapor recovery tower where approximately 95% of the flash occurs, then sent to the oil/condensate tanks. Produced water from the heater treaters is sent to the produced water tanks. Produced gas from the heater treaters and emissions from the tanks are sent to the process flare for 98% destruction efficiency. The oil/condensate and produced water are loaded to trucks for transport to market and disposal, respectively. The loading vapors are routed to the flare for 98% destruction. Other sources of emission include fugitive emissions from piping and emissions from MSS.

<b>Permit No.:</b> 143023	Company Name: Hunt Oil Company	APD Reviewer: Ms. Lillian Hayes
<b>Project No.:</b> 261484	Site/Area Name: Davis Central Facility	SP No.: 6002 - NON RULE 2012-NOV-08

#### DESCRIBE PROJECT AND INVOLVED PROCESS

A project has been submitted to certify the emissions from Davis Central Facility under a Non-Rule Standard Permit. The RE has provided all required information including a site plan, area map, process flow diagram, gas and liquid analyses, emissions for each facility, emission summary, emission calculations, technical documents, Federal applicability information, and completed checklists. The company wishes to void PBR 112110 upon issuance of this authorization.

OIL AND GAS FACILITY GENERAL INFORMATION						
Natural Gas Throughput (MMSCF/day):	0.08	H <sub>2</sub> S Content of Inlet Gas:	17,000 ppm			
Oil/Condensate Throughput (bbl/day):	150	Is the gas sweet or sour?	Sour			
Produced Water Throughput (bbl/day):	350	Is this site operational/producing?	Yes			

EQUIPMENT/PRO	CESSES AT SITE			
Number of each:	Compressor Engines:		Glycol dehydrators:	VRU:
	Separators:		Amine units:	Other:
	Storage Tanks:	9	Heater Treaters: 3*	Other:
	Truck Loading:	2	Flares: 1	Other:

<sup>\*</sup>Note: The H2S content of fuel gas is limited to 10,970 ppmv. A chemical gas scavenger unit may be added to the site if H2S concentrations measured at the site warrant the use of the equipment. A maximum of two heaters can be fired simultaneously.

STORAGE TANKS	TORAGE TANKS										
		Throughput (bbl/day)		Working and breathing	Flash Loss Calculation Method	Other					
TNK1-TNK3	400 BBL	350	3 Produced Water	Tanks 4.0	GOR via VMGSim	Routed to Flare for					
			Tanks			98% destruction					
TNK7-TNK12	400 BBL	150	6 Oil/Condensate	Tanks 4.0	GOR via VMGSim	efficiency					
			Tanks								

TANKS 4.0 SOFTW	FANKS 4.0 SOFTWARE [FOR ESTIMATING WORKING AND BREATHING LOSSES FROM STORAGE TANKS]									
Tank Identifier (EPN)		year	Component	<b>4</b>	Vapor MW	(last page of	Emissions after any controls (tpy)			
TNK1-TNK3	1,788,500 (per tank)	106.44	Crude Oil RVP 5	RVP 5	50	3114.67	0.02 (per tank)			
TNK7-TNK12	383,250 (per tank)	22.81	Crude Oil RVP 5	RVP 5	50	2015.14	1.09 (per tank)			

	Valves	Flanges	Connectors	Ended lines		Other	content of	Total Annual Emissions (tpy)
Gas	Gas 71 76		186	2	3	3	43.2% VOC	3.35 tpy VOC 0.11 tpy H2S
Light Oil	36	68	58		1	1	99.6% VOC	
Water/Oil	22	44	37				0.5% H2S	
f VOC content of gas stream was inlet or other laboratory malysis included?		555555555555555555555555555555555555555	e of iple:	600000000000000000000000000000000000000	content from nalysis (wt %	20000E	H <sub>,</sub> S content fr analysis (wt %	

TRUCK LOADING [EMISSIONS CALCULATE	D USING L <sub>i</sub> =(12.46)(S)(P)(M	)/(T) EQUATION F	ROM AP-42, SECT	ION 5.2-4]				
What is being loaded (crude oil, condensate, or water): Produced Water/Oil								
P (lb/lb- T	L, (lb VOC/1000 gallons	Hourly Loading Rate			Annual Emissions			
S (psia) mole) (R)	1 ~	• • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • •			(tpy)			

Permit No.:	143023	Compo	Company Name: Hunt Oil Company				: N	Ms. Lillian Hayes				
Project No.:	261484	Site/A	rea Name:	Davis Central Facility		SP No.:	1000000000	5002 - NON RULE 2012-NOV-08				
0.60	8.51 5	50	579.73	5.50	8000	5368000	0.44	0.08				
0.60	6.71	50	567.22	4.43	8000	2304000	35.60	0 3.02				
Are there any controls (explain): Routed to flare for 98% destruction												

COMMUNICA	ATION LOG							
Date	Time	Name/Company	Subject of Communication					
12/6/2016	1:24pm	Mr. Justin Wheeler/Hunt Oil	Phone: Reviewer contacted and left a voicemail message for Mr. Wheeler regarding the use of out of county SO2 monitors for background concentration and requesting the call out pages.					
12/6/2016	1:54pm	Ms. Elena Nirlo/Zephyr	Phone: Voicemail					
12/7/2016	1:05pm	Ms. Elena Nirlo/Zephyr	Phone: Reviewer contacted Ms. Nirlo. The company did not use any other modeling program. They used the EPA's site to get concentrations for Ellis County which is more conservative.					
			Email: Ms. Nirlo responded to reviewer.					
			Dear Ms. Hayes,					
12/8/2016	10:43am	Ms. Elena Nirlo/Zephyr	As discussed over the phone yesterday, please find attached an Impacts Analysis Package for the Davis Central Facility (Permit No. 143023) that you can send directly to the Modeling Group.					
			For context, I have also attached a complete electronic copy of the application submitted, where impacts are discussed on pages 26-29 and 66-78 of the pdf.					
			Please let me know if you have any additional questions.					
12/16/2016:	Reviewer spo	ke with Team Leader and Modeling Team	who approved the company's use of out of county SO2 monitors.					
12/19/2016	1:40pm	Ms. Elena Nirlo/Zephyr	Phone: Reviewer contacted Ms. Nirlo regarding the tanks being routed to the flare. The annual emissions match but the hourly emissions do not. It appears as if only one produced water and one oil tank's emissions are being shown in the flare calculations hourly. Ms. Nirlo indicated that only one tank is filled at a time.					
12/21/2016	10:00am	Ms. Elena Nirlo/Zephyr	Phone: Reviewer contacted Ms. Nirlo and left a voicemail message asking for H2S emissions to be added to EPNs HT1, HT2, and HT3.					
12/22/2016	4:34pm	Ms. Elena Nirlo/Zephyr Cc: Mr. Justin Wheeler/Hunt Mr. Tomas Sullivan/Zephyr	Email: Ms. Nirlo responded to reviewer. Dear Ms. Hayes, I received your voicemail yesterday about adding trace H2S emissions at the heater treaters. Please find attached replacement pages for the NRSP submittal, where we have added calculations for H2S emissions based on the fuel gas H2S content, and 98% destruction efficiency at the heater treater. Updated sections are highlighted in a light pink color for your convenience. Please let me know if you have any additional questions.					

<b>Permit No.:</b> 143023	Company Name:	Hunt Oil Company	APD Reviewer:	Ms. Lillian Hayes
<b>Project No.:</b> 261484	Site/Area Name:	Davis Central Facility	SP No.:	6002 - NON RULE 2012-NOV-08

							STIMAT	ED EMES	8085													
EPN	FIN	Emission Source Name	V0	c"	N N	Эх		Ø	616	l.,	FFR	8,,		0,	Ben	zene		S	Formal	dehyde	Total I	(APs <sup>(3)</sup>
cra .	F 187	Emission Source rame	Bulling	tpy	lbßsr	tps	tiseter	tpay	Billion	tpy	lb/hs	toy	llaður	tgay	Bahr	tpy	16:9 ir	tpy	lb/hr	tpay	Hathr	igoy
FUG-1	FUG-1	Fugitive Emissions	6.77	3.35				٠.					11.7		⊴0.01	<0.01	80.0	0.11			8.02	0.98
H1-1	M37-1	Heater Treater 1 [5]	<0.01	0,01	0.05	0.21	0.84	9.38	<0.01	0.62	< 0.01	0.02	6.70	80,8	<0.01	<8.01	<0.01	0.03	<0.01	<0.01	<0,01	<0.01
BT-2	MT-2	Heater Treater 3 [3]	<0.01	0.01	0.05	0.21	0.04	0.18	<6.01	0.69:	<0,(81	0.03	6.70	3.08	<0.01	<0.01	<0.61	0.03	<0.01	<0.00	<0.01	<0.01
HT-3	M7-3	Heater Treater 3 [3]	<0.01	9.01	0.05	0.21	0.04	0.18	<5.01	0.02	<0.01	0.02	6.70	3.08	<0.01	<0.01	<0.61	0.03	<0.01	40,51	<0.01	<0.01
LOAD	LOAD	Truck Loading	10.71	0.92										,	0.02	< 0.01	0.11	0.02			0.32	0.63
		Flare Pilot	9.03	0.14	0.01	0.00	0.03	0.13					6.22	0.98	<0.01	<0.01	<0.01	0.01			<0.01	<0.91
		Combustion Products from Centrolled Yanks	-		0.64	0.05	0.07	0.09				-	0.76	1.45	-							
	Fi_:	Combustion Products from Truck Loading		~	0.18	0.01	0.33	0.03				~	0.50	0.07		~~			~	~	٠.	
		Combustion Products from Heater Treater Gas		-	0.60	2.62	1.19	5.22				-	9.35	40.98		-			-			
		Combustion Products from VRT Gas			0.52	0.05	0.95	0.10					0.24	0.53								
Plut	TNK-1, TNK-2, TNK-3, TNK-7, TNK-8, TNK-9, TNK-10, TNK- 11, TNK-12	Controlled Tables	Ð.11	0.15			~			~	~		~	s-2	<0.91	<0.01	<0.01	0.02	~	~	<0.01	<0.93
	LOAD	Truck Loading	0.50	0.84									· · ·		<0,01	40,01	<0.61	<0.01			8.01	<0.01
	HT-GAS	Heater Treater Gas	1.37	5.98			-								<0.01	9.02	0.10	0.44			8.04	0.19
	VRT-GAS	Vapor Recovery Tower Gas	0.09	0.20			~	~				-		~	<0.01	<0.01	40.01	< 0.01	~-		<0.01	<0.03
MSS-HTROLN	MSS-HTROUN	Vacuum Trucks (Heater Treater Cleanout)	2.25	<33.03		٠	~		**	^^	**	٠.,	^^		40.61	<0.01	0.01	<0.01	~-		0.07	<0.01
M33-PIG	MSS-PIG	Pig Launcher Degassing	6.01	<0.03											<0,01	<0.01	<0,01	<0.01	-		<0.61	<0.03
MSS-TNKCLN	MSS-TNKCLN	Vacuum Trucks (Oil/Condensate Tank Cisenout)	4.87	<0.01	· ·				· · ·			· ·			49,91	<0.01	0.52	<0.01			0.14	<0.01
MSS-TNKCLN	MSS-TNKCLN	Vecuum Trucks (Produced Water Cleanout)	0.06	<0.01		~	-					~			sQ,01	<0.01	<0.91	<0.01	-		<0.01	<0.01
MSS-PIPE	MSS-PIPE	Pipeline Degresing	0.01	<0.01	~	~	~	```	~	~	~~	~	T	~	e0.01	<0.01	<0.01	<0.01	~		<0.01	<0.01
M33-F3	Mas-Fa	Filters/Strainers	36.0	<0.01		-	-					-		-	<0.01	<0.01	0.04	<9.01			0.02	<0.01
MSS-MISC	M88-M9C	Miscellaneous MSS	9.66	0.25											≤0.01	<0.01	<0.61	0.01			<0.01	<0.01
Estimated	Emissions	Total Emessions	21.52	11.63	6.93	3.44	1.75	8.12	<0.01	0.65	<0.03	0.05	12.48	53.21	6.05	0.03	0,35	0.71	<0.01	<0.81	6.63	0.33

<sup>\*</sup>Note: Heater Treaters- the H2S content of fuel gas is limited to 10,970 ppmv. A maximum of two heaters can be fired simultaneously.

	TECHNICAL REVIEWER	PEER REVIEWER	FINAL REVIEWER
SIGNATURE:	J. Land Copy	757	Swit
PRINTED NAME:	Ms. Lillian Hayes	Mr. Mark McDonald, Work Leader	Mr. Samuel Short, Manager
DATE:	January 2, 2017	January 3, 2017	January 4, 2017